Summary of EPA's Technical Stakeholder Committee (TSC) Meeting #4
Yosemite Slough Site
May 2, 2013
EPA Offices; 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA

Meeting Participants: See Attached Participant list.

Action Items

- None

Key Meeting Summary Notes

1. EPA Presentation. The majority of the meeting focused on EPA's power point presentation. The presentation was sent out in advance to all TSC members via May 1st email from EPA Project Manager Craig Cooper. Cooper stated that EPA's presentation and a summary of this TSC meeting will be posted on EPA website for Yosemite Slough at www.epa.gov/region9/YosemiteSlough

2. Coordination with Adjacent Projects. Some TSC members expressed concerns regarding the sequence of project activity among EPA's Slough cleanup project, the Navy's Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Parcel F cleanup project, and State Parks wetlands restoration project and the potential for cross-contamination between projects. Cooper (EPA) affirmed that project sequence and schedule coordination is important, project activities will be coordinated and some activities may occur concurrently if appropriate. Cooper also said that the he and Navy project managers are already in communication on this issue. EPA will address this concern in more detail when the Slough cleanup project reaches the design stage. EPA has a regulatory role at both Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (Shipyard) and Yosemite Slough and can facilitate project coordination. In addition, the Water Board has a regulatory role at the Shipyard, State Parks Wetlands Restoration, and Yosemite Slough cleanup (via CWA Section 401 and potentially as a co-regulator with EPA).

3. Site Boundaries and Ownership. Cooper confirmed that the Slough Site boundary shown in the EPA presentation is approximate and actual Site boundaries will be identified in remedy design documentation and based on mean high tide line survey line and State Parks wetlands restoration "as-built" project survey lines. Cooper also confirmed that Site ownership is with the City & County of San Francisco (via a SF Port Authority trusteeship) as described in the EECA.

4. Biologically Action Zone (BAZ). Cooper explained why Slough project objectives and sediment remediation goals focus on the BAZ. Cooper also explained that the EPA believes the BAZ to be 6 inches deep and EPA why has applied an 18-inch margin of safety below the BAZ for purposes of remedy selection in the EECA. The margin of safety will be re-evaluated during the remedy design stage. Cooper explained that the re-evaluation of the margin of safety below the BAZ will be based on several factors including: (i) depth necessary to protect birds (e.g. California Clapper Rail), fish (e.g. Green Sturgeon) and other ecological receptors and human receptors, (ii) the content of the cap design (e.g. armoring layer, sand layers, biological layer, etc) to assure long-term effectiveness and restoration of a mudflat ecology, (iii) and assumptions for dredge tolerance for the remediation contractor. Cooper agreed that the process to re-evaluate the margin of safety below the

BAZ needs to be clearly explained to the general public. Cooper also to consider adding a few sentence in the Introduction Section of the EECA to explain that the figures in the EECA are conceptual (not meant for design purposes) and cost-estimates are approximate (i.e. expected accuracy range of the cost estimate is –30 to +50 percent actual costs).

5. EPA Recommended Alternative. Cooper presented the details for Alternative 5, EPA's recommended cleanup alternative. A TSC member stated that the concept of design flexibility needs to be more prominent in the EECA. Cooper agreed to re-check the EECA on this point and how EECA explains what is being decided now under Alternative 5 and what will be decided during the design stage.

6. Scope Design Technical Studies and decisions to be made during the design stage. Cooper explained that the EECA identified a preliminary list of technical studies that may be appropriate to support the remedy design and he explained that this list may be modified and further clarified in the future either in the Final EECA or in site documents after the EECA (i.e. EPA's settlement agreement with the PRPs). Cooper then presented list of key decisions to be made during the remedy design process. Due to the importance of these decisions, Cooper agreed that it would likely be appropriate to re-engage the Technical Stakeholder Committee together with the Bayview community during the remedy design process. A TSC member asked if projections regarding sea-level rise for the SF Bay Area has been considered in the EECA as this may impact the percent of the Slough that would have subtidal versus intertidal marine environments. Cooper stated that question is better addressed during the remedy design stage when sediment cap thickness is decided.

7. Preliminary Comments on the Working-Draft EECA. *[Note: Cooper agreed to extend the TSC's comment deadline on the Working-Draft EECA to May 17th. TSC members can simply email their comments to Craig Cooper by May 17th (i.e. a formal letter is not necessary at this time). TSC members are also welcome to formally comment during EPA public comment period on the Draft EECA this summer.]*

- A TSC member stated that his agency will support taking Alternative 6 (not Alternative 5) through to a detailed design evaluation due to potential erosion and resulting lack of protectiveness of Alternative 5 at the east end of the Slough (i.e. at the mouth of Slough).
- A TSC member suggested that EPA could modify Alternative 5 to make it clear that some sediment testing may be performed at the east end of Site to fill apparent data gaps and that results of the design-level hydrodynamic model may create then need for a sediment cap to address erosion and potential and create adequate long-term effectiveness site-wide (including portions that are not slated for capping due to current contaminant concentrations in the 0-1 foot interval.
- A TSC member suggested that EPA's use of High, Moderate and Low in Table 9-1 (for Short-term and Long-Term effectiveness) appeared subjective. Cooper acknowledged that EPA's application of High, Moderate and Low scorings in Table 9-1 was based on EPA's professional judgement of applying the evaluation criteria to each alternative.
- TSC members had different opinions on how important nearby business and residential communities may feel about the Short-Term Impacts to the Community (e.g. odor impacts and trucking on

neighborhood streets) versus the need for a long-term protective remedy. Cooper stated that EPA is going to start early outreach to key community stakeholders in May and June prior to the public comment period slated for summer 2013. EPA will raise this issue with community representatives to get a better idea community sentiment on this question.

- One TSC member raised a concern that Alternative 5 has an apparent inconsistency that portions of the Site currently meeting RGs in the 0-1 interval are left undisturbed (with a 1 foot clean cover) whereas actionable portions of the Site may have a sediment cap up to 2 feet of clean cover. Cooper acknowledged this aspect of Alternative 5 but the final difference in the passively capped zones and the actively capped zones may become less different depending on the results of the design process. Plus, ultimately Cooper emphasized that protectiveness is based on long-term testing of the BAZ (top 6 inches of Site sediment) to ensure that the RG's are met in the BAZ sitewide.
- A TSC member suggested that EPA should considering strengthening the decision rule under Alternative 5 for digging down to up to 2 feet deep. Currently, Alternative 5 requires digging to up to 2 feet if concerntrations in the 1-2 foot interval exceeds 2 times RGs. If this decision rule is strengthen to 1 times RGs, only one more polygon would get triggered for excavation to up to 2 feet deep and therefore this appears to cost-effective way to strengthen Alternative 5.
- A TSC member stated that now that Spartina has been removed from the Slough, bird and fish usage of the Slough has increased and such usage should continue to increased after Site cleanup and completion of the State wetlands project.
- A TSC member suggested that since Alternative 5 includes some slough bank stabilization in Phase III of the State Parks wetlands restoration project area (which is currently unfunded), the Yosemite Slough CERCLA cleanup project should be expanded to take over the design and construction of the rest of the Phase III project tasks including limited grading, trail installation, and plantings in the relatively small land acreage managed by State Parks around the westside of the Site. By doing so, bioswales and other stormwater management features that EPA has previously discussed for the Phase III area can be integrated in a timely fashion. However, other TSC members noted that this is not one of the Removal Action Objectives (RAOs) for the Site.
- A TSC member raised a concern about the trail alignment around the Slough and that the trail should not be placed too close to the Slough shoreline areas.
- A TSC member suggested that the cost estimate for the design studies should be a fixed cost (approximately $900,000) instead of 10% percent of the capital cost of each alternative. Another TSC member stated that design cost always escalate and the $900,000 should be in addition to the 10% of the capital costs.
- A TSC member suggested that the map show potential project staging and sediment dewatering areas should show State Parks Phase II Wetlands area (but removing the State Parks offices and garden areas) are should be presented as only a potential project staging area and not a potential sediment dewatering area. The sediment dewatering area should be only the larger rectangle in the SF 49er overflow parking lot.
- A TSC member suggested that the EECA cost estimate for debris removal associated with Slough bank

and shoreline stabilization was significantly too low.

- A TSC member suggested that the Slough bank and shoreline stabilization was a critical aspect of remedy protectiveness and an important aesthetic improvement to the Slough.
- A TSC member stressed the importance of 6-inch BAZ and questioned the need for the full 18-inch margin of safety. This thickness is dependent on several cap parameters that are the subject of required design-level studies. The same member also pointed out the similarity between Alternatives 2 and 5 and the need to maintain flexibility in the design phase regarding the possibility of revising the BAZ and the margin of safety. The differences between these alternatives rest primarily on assumptions related to cap design. EPA is open to including a site-specific study of BAZ that will help to inform decisions about cap design; however complexities concerning such a study would have to be worked out.
- A TSC member noted that the Alice Griffith neighborhood may be very concerned and vocal about short-term impacts of the slough cleanup project especially odors generated by the project. There was additional discussion of public input on the EE/CA and the process overall. Cooper will have informal meetings with the public and invite input on the design. The TSC member added that the community should not be expected to speak with one voice on any given subject. There will likely be a variety of opinions in the community concerning various aspects of this project.
- A TSC member requested the most recent PCB data from State Parks Department, particularly with respect to the southern shore area that will constitute Phase 2 of the wetlands restoration project. State Parks said that they have reviewed the data with Cooper by phone, but have not issued its written report at this time. State Parks said that it would share this data report concurrent with its design documentation submittals for the Phase 2 wetlands project.
- A TSC member raised the possibility of stockpiling cleaner sediment for use as capping materials. Cooper does not express interest in this due to difficulties on segregating dredged sediment based on contaminant content. A TSC member asked Cooper to reduce the size of the indicated area for sediment processing.
- A TSC member stated that property owners of land used for project staging or sediment processing may want compensation for use of the property. Another TSC member suggests that an amount be added to the cost estimate for this.

Yosemite Slough TECH Stakeholder Meeting #4 - May 2, 2013

Name	Representing	Email	Telephone
Craig Cooper	USEPA	cooper.craig@epa.gov	415-947-4148
Amy Brownell	SFDPH	amy.brownell@sfdph.org	415-252-3967
Ned Black	US EPA	black.ned@epa.gov	415-972-3055
Elizabeth Nixon	Northgate	elizabeth.nixon@ngem.com	510 839 0688 ext 220
Gary Smith	DPR	gsmith@parks.ca.gov	(916) 698 5979
Cecille Caterson	CSPF	cecille@calparks.org	(415) 262-4406
Patricia DuMont	DPR	Patti.DuMont@parks.ca.gov	916.445.9081
LAURA WILSON	DPR	LAURA.WILSON@PARKS.CA.GOV	707 769 5652 x248
Tina Low	Water Board	tlow@waterboards.ca.gov	510 622 5682
Philip Spadaro	TIG	PSPADARO@INTEG-GROUP.COM	206.390.2842
Bridgette DeShields	Integral	bdeshields@integral-corp.com	707-775-2488
YVONNE FONG	US EPA	fong.yvonnew@epa.gov	415 947 4117
Rafael Mandelman	BCDC	rafaelm@bcdc.ca.gov	415-352-3670
Erica Yelensky	US EIA	yelensky.erica@epa.gov	415 972 3021
Carol Campagna	Shell	carol.campagna@shell.com	707-864-1617
Joe Dillon	NOAA Fisheries	Joseph.J.Dillon@noaa.gov	707-575-6093
Arthur Feinstein	Sierra Club	arthurfeinstein@earthlink.net	415-680-0643
Sam Bloom	Arc Ecology	sbloom@arcecology.org	415-643 1190

BY CONFERENCE CALL:

Martha Walters, Arc Ecology

Bruce Noble, Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)

Dave Robberson, demaximus

Carolyn Marn, US Fish & Wildlife Service

Dave Puchalski, New Fields